



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/051,065

01/16/2002

Pete Rowley

AOL0023

3384

22862

7590

05/02/2006

GLENN PATENT GROUP
3475 EDISON WAY, SUITE L
MENLO PARK, CA 94025

EXAMINER

ORTIZ, BELIX M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED: 05/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/051,065

Applicant(s)

ROWLEY, PETE

Examiner

Belix M. Ortiz

Art Unit

2164

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 February 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14, 16-26, 29-38 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 10-14, 16-26, 29-38 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Remarks

1. In response to communications files on 1-February-2006, claims 35-38 are amended and claim 1 is amended per applicant's request. Therefore, claims 1-14, 16-26, and 29-38 are presently pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Van Huben et al. (U.S. patent 6,484,177).

As to claim 1, Van Huben et al. teaches in a directory server containing heterogeneous directory entries, a method of hierarchically navigating the entries (see column 2, lines 6-11; column 5, lines 33-35; and column 14, lines 7-21) comprising the steps of:

creating one or more directory views (see abstract; column 1, lines 8-9; and column 5, lines 8-13);

organizing the directory views into a hierarchy, wherein the step of organizing uses only information concerning the entries, wherein each of the directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, the filter attribute containing a filter that describes the directory view (see column 2, lines 1-11; column 2, 51-56, column 8, lines 45-51; column 11, lines 23-30; column 12, lines 56-59; column 15, lines 54-64; and column 16, lines 20-29); and using one of the directory views that is most appropriate for navigating to the entries (see abstract and column 1, lines 8-17; column 2, lines 54-56; and column 15, lines 54-56).

As to claim 2, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the entries do not need to be physically in any particular place (see column 7, lines 12-14; column 7, lines 40-59; and column 11, lines 37-38).

As to claim 3, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the directory server may have a flat directory information tree (see column 2, lines 23-26; column 7, lines 49-52; column 13, lines 63-65; and column 20, lines 31-35).

As to claim 4, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the existence of the directory views is transparent to a client of the directory server and the client is not required to have special knowledge of the directory views to use them (see column 11, lines 47-52 and column 12, lines 16-18).

As to claim 5, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views begins with an ordinary entry (see column 2, lines 12-17 and column 12, lines 56-59).

As to claim 6, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views belongs to a specific object class that contains a filter attribute, the filter attribute containing a filter that describes the views (see column 11, lines 23-30 and column 16, lines 20-29).

As to claim 7, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the filter attribute is omitted from the views to facilitate a hierarchical directory structure (see column 16, lines 30-31).

As to claim 8, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein each of the directory views comprises sub-views which provide a subset of the views (see column 2, lines 26-36).

As to claim 9, Van Huben et al. teaches wherein the sub-views comprises different subject domains from the directory views (see column 9, lines 41-49).

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 10-14, 16-26, and 29-38 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

8. Applicant's arguments filed 3-March-2005 with respect to the rejected claims in view of the cited references have been fully considered but they are not found persuasive:

In response to applicants' arguments that Van Huben et al. "does not teach that only the information concerning the entries is used in organizing the directory view", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Van Huben et al. teaches "The objectclass definitions used to implement the Sony example are industry (61), sector (62) and appliance (63). These objectclass definitions specify the required and allowed (optional) attributes. All LDAP entries are required to have an objectclass attribute to describe its contents", (see Van Huben et al., column 16, lines 20-24).

In response to applicants' arguments that Van Huben et al. "organizing the director views into a hierarchy using only information concerning the entries", the arguments have been fully considered but are not deemed persuasive, because Van Huben et al. teaches "teaches a method wherein a common logical structure is used to store both the files residing in a file system as well as the directory entries comprising a directory service. This approach permits directory service entries across multiple domains to be managed in a centralized fashion. Also, since the directory service entries are objects, standardized operations such as replication, querying and storing additional information is possible", (see Van Huben et al., column 2, lines 12-20).

Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Belix M. Ortiz whose telephone number is 571-272-4081. The examiner can normally be reached on moday-friday 9am-5pm.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.


CHARLES RONES
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER